FILED

17 OCT -2 AM 9: 11

CLERA, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
WORTHERN DISTRICT OF OND
CLEVELAND

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

PAMELA D. BRINSON,	) CASE NO. 1:17 CV 1956
Plaintiff,	) JUDGE DAN AARON POLSTER
v. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, et al.,	) ) ) ) ) MEMORANDUM OF OPINION ) AND ORDER )
Defendants.	<b>'</b>

On September 18, 2017, plaintiff *pro se* Pamela D. Brinson filed this *in forma pauperis* action against U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Pamela E. Ashby, and Adreas Gonzales. Plaintiff alleges in her complaint that she is a Section 8 housing voucher recipient. She further alleges that despite the fact she follows Section 8 rules, she is the subject of surveillance by a vehicle parked outside her apartment, and that HUD has placed listening devices near her front door. Plaintiff asserts violation of her right to due process and seeks monetary and injunctive relief.

Although *pro se* pleadings are liberally construed, *Boag v. MacDougall*, 454 U.S. 364, 365 (1982) (per curiam), the district court is required to dismiss an action under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) if it fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or if it lacks an arguable basis in law or fact. Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319 (1989); Hill v. Lappin, 630 F.3d 468, 470 (6<sup>th</sup>

An in forma pauperis claim may be dismissed sua sponte, without prior notice to the plaintiff and without service of process on the defendant, if the court explicitly states that it is invoking section 1915(e) [formerly 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d)] and is dismissing the claim (continued...)

Cir. 2010)

A cause of action fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted when it lacks "plausibility in the complaint." *Bell At. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 564 (2007). A pleading must contain a "short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 677-78 (2009). The factual allegations in the pleading must be sufficient to raise the right to relief above the speculative level on the assumption that all the allegations in the complaint are true. *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555. The plaintiff is not required to include detailed factual allegations, but must provide more than "an unadorned, the-defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me accusation." *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678 (2009). A pleading that offers legal conclusions or a simple recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not meet this pleading standard. *Id*.

Principles requiring generous construction of *pro se* pleadings are not without limits. Beaudett v. City of Hampton, 775 F.2d 1274, 1277 (4th Cir. 1985). A complaint must contain either direct or inferential allegations respecting all the material elements of some viable legal theory to satisfy federal notice pleading requirements. See Schied v. Fanny Farmer Candy Shops, Inc., 859 F.2d 434, 437 (6th Cir. 1988). District courts are not required to conjure up questions never squarely presented to them or to construct full blown claims from sentence fragments. Beaudette, 775 F.2d at 1278. To do so would "require ...[the courts] to explore exhaustively all potential claims of a pro se plaintiff, ... [and] would...transform the district court from its legitimate advisory role to the improper role of an advocate seeking out the strongest arguments and most successful strategies for a party." Id.

Even construing the Complaint liberally in a light most favorable to the plaintiff, *Brand v. Motley*, 526 F.3d 921, 924 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2008), it does not contain allegations reasonably suggesting

<sup>(...</sup>continued)

for one of the reasons set forth in the statute. Chase Manhattan Mortg. Corp. v. Smith, 507 F.3d 910, 915 (6th Cir. 2007); Gibson v. R.G. Smith Co., 915 F.2d 260, 261 (6th Cir. 1990); Harris v. Johnson, 784 F.2d 222, 224 (6th Cir. 1986).

she might have a valid federal claim. *See*, *Lillard v. Shelby County Bd. of Educ*,, 76 F.3d 716 (6th Cir. 1996)(court not required to accept summary allegations or unwarranted legal conclusions in determining whether complaint states a claim for relief). This action is therefore dismissed under section 1915(e). The court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that an appeal from this decision could not be taken in good faith.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DAN AARON POLSTER

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE